REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are pending in the present application. Claims 13 and 38 has been amended to correct minor informalities. Claims 1, 19, 25, and 44 are independent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTION

Claims 26 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

In formulating this rejection, the Examiner asserts that claims 26 and 45 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the element (a) "said entry comprises responses poll results and frequency" is new matter. In response to this rejection, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 4, lines 14-16 of the original specification which recites:

"...it is within the scope of the system of the invention to enter data representing response to advertisements, such as awareness polls results, the frequency with which an advertisement on the Internet is visited, etc., ...".

Applicants respectfully assert that the above passage provides literal support for element (a) of dependent claims 26 and 45. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTION

Claims 26, 38, and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended dependent claim 38 (and also dependent claim 13) to correct an obvious typographical error. With respect to claims 26 and 45, Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

With respect to claims 26 and 45, the Examiner asserts that element "(a)" is indefinite because "entry" is a process, while responses, etc. are results.

Applicants again direct the Examiner's attention to the passage at page 4, lines 14-16, of the original specification, which recites that it is within this scope of the system of the present invention to enter data representing responses to advertisements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the "responses" referred to at column 4, line 15 of the original specification may be used to control the entry of data. In this context, Applicants believe that it is reasonable that a subsequent "entry" may be based on a previously received "response". Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(A) WITEK ET AL./ NEXPO '97 REJECTION

Claims 1-50 have again been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Witek et al. and further in view of NEXPO '97. This rejection, insofar as its pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 1 recites "a single system supporting entry, sales and management of several related advertisements and several media

based on a single advertisement order" (emphasis added). Witek et al. teaches the option of placing the <u>same</u> ad in newspaper print <u>or</u> in an on-line service. In Witek et al., if an ad is placed in both a newspaper print and in an on-line service, two separate and independent processes are required, since parallel and simultaneous processing of ads is not supported by the system disclosed by Witek et al. On the contrary, the system disclosed by Witek et al. only support sequential processing of ads - i.e. the placing of one ad after the other. The Examiner admits that Witek et al. does not teach entry, sale <u>and</u> management of several related ads based on entry of a single advertisement order. In order to make up for this deficiency, the Examiner asserts that NEXPO '97 teaches reusing content, citing page 27, which the Examiner asserts reads on entry, sale <u>and</u> management of several related pieces of content based on entry of the single piece of content.

Applicants respectfully submit that the citing on page 27 in NEXPO '97 relates to a product offered by Quark Publishing System (QXP). It is respectfully submitted that the product offered by QXP is a layout and production tool for bringing text and graphics together in a creative layout - see the above paragraph on page 27. Thus, the product offered by QXP is intended for use in a different environment and for a different purpose compared to the Witek et al. invention, and therefore, NEXPO '97 and Witek et al. are not combinable. For example, the QXP have no knowledge of - or capabilities for - generating sales, entry or management data in the order process.

Applicants respectfully submit that the teaching of NEXPO '97 relating to "...accessing multiple publications at the same time" and "...reuse of content of single text and picture files" should be seen in the content of purely creative layout processes in a production environment

which is fundamentally different from the system according to the present invention in that the present system also discloses features including publishing, and customer and business matters.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that at most, NEXPO '97 teaches the reuse of content of text and picture files in purely creative and layout processes in a production environment.

As a result, the combination of Witek, et al. and NEXPO '97 adds nothing to the teaching of Witek et al. - namely, the placing of the <u>same</u> ad in newspaper print <u>or</u> in an on-line service. Independent claim 1 recites entry, sale, <u>and</u> management in the conjunctive, namely separated by "and". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Witek et al. and NEXPO '97 completely fails to teach the administrative task of handling advertisement orders including entry, sale and management. Applicants respectfully submit that entry, sale and management include such administrative tasks as selling, defining, creating, pricing, accounting, customer contract handling, creating statistics, <u>and</u> sale automation, as set forth on page 4, lines 1-3 and 13-14 of the original specification. The present invention as defined in independent claims 1, 19, 25, and 44 facilitates controlled and parallel processing of related ads in order for these ads to be published in a plurality of publications. This multiplicity and flexibility is not provided by a system derivable from a combination of Witek et al. and NEXPO '97. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants further respectfully submit that independent claims 19, 25, and 44 are allowable for similar reasons. Applicants further respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-18, 20-24, 26-43, and 45-50 are allowable by virtue of their dependency and allowable independent claims 1, 19, 25, and 44 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Application No. 09/482,462 Docket No. 45900-000391/US

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the various rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-50 is respectfully requested.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$110.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A/Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. 236x 8910

Reston, Virginia 20195

(//U**/**3) 668-8000

JAC/cah